

Interview Summary

Applicant No.

10/045,049

Applicant(s)

OSWALD ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen J Stein

Art Unit

1775

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Stephen J Stein (Examiner).

(3) _____.

(2) Vincent Shier, Ph.D (Applicants' Representative).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 August 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 9-13 and 17.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent 5,672,330 (Hartmann et al.).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants' representative telephoned to discuss possible ways to overcome the rejection to claims 9-13 by the Hartmann reference. Applicants' representative proposed possibly providing a showing of insufficient specificity of disclosed range in the Hartmann reference by means of a 1.132 affidavit to thereby overcome the overlapping range for the claimed Rutile TiO₂ content. This Examiner informed applicants' representative that arguments in conjunction with such a showing would be carefully considered by this examiner, but that the filing of an RCE would have to accompany any such argument and showing since prosecution is currently closed.